



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,489	11/09/2000	Yukio Mori	P107314-0001	9177
7590	04/23/2004		EXAMINER	
Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn Suite 600 1050 Connecticut Avenue NW Washington, DC 20036-5339			AGGARWAL, YOGESH K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2615	
DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/674,489	MORI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yogesh K Aggarwal	2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11/09/2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

***Specification***

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata (US Patent # 5,844,603) in view of Suzuki (JP Patent # 10322684).

[Claim 1]

Ogata teaches the following:

A camera signal processor (figure 1: 25) characterized by comprising:  
motion detection means (figure 1: 25) for dividing an image picked up by imaging means into a plurality of motion detection areas (figures 6E-6G), and detecting the motion of the image for each of the motion detection areas (Ogata, col. 5 lines 40-44, figures 6E-6G);

extracting means for extracting (figure 1: 25), on the basis of the motion of the image for each of the motion detection areas (figures 6E-6G) which has been detected by the motion detection means (figure 1: 25), the motion detection area where an object making abnormal motion exists (col. 5 lines 40-50 figures 6A-6G). Ogata fails to teach image enlarging means for enlarging the image picked up by the imaging means, centered on the motion detection area where an object making abnormal motion exists which has been extracted by the extracting means and displaying the enlarged image on a display device. However Suzuki teaches that it is well known and used in the art to have an image enlarging means (figure 1: 7) for enlarging the image picked up by the imaging means (figure 1: 1), centered on the motion detection area where an object making abnormal motion exists which has been extracted by the extracting means (figure 1: 4) and displaying the enlarged image on a display device (Solution to the Abstract, lines 1-19).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ogata and Suzuki it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a enlarging means for enlarging the image picked up by the imaging means, centered on the motion detection area where an object making abnormal motion exists which has been extracted by the extracting means and displaying the enlarged image on a display device. Doing so would allow displaying the enlarged image data by detecting an abnormal state of the data with conditions which are previously set for the respective image areas of an image and superimposing enlarged image data for enlarging and displaying as taught in Suzuki (Problem to be solved part of the Abstract).

[Claim 2]

The camera signal processor according to claim 1, characterized in that the extracting means extracts (Ogata, figure 1: 25), out of the motion detection areas (Ogata, figures 6E-6G), the motion detection area where the motion of the image which has been detected by the motion detection means (Ogata, figure 1: 25) coincides with an abnormal motion pattern previously set as an area where an object making abnormal motion exists (Ogata, col. 5 lines 40-50 figures 6A-6G)

[Claims 4 and 5]

These are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 1 and 2 respectively. Therefore they has been analyzed and rejected based upon the functional steps of the apparatus claims 1 and 2.

3. Claims 3/1,3/2,6/4 and 6/5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata (US Patent # 5,844,603) in view of Suzuki (JP Patent # 10322684) as applied to claim 1 above in view of Matsumara et al. (US Patent # 6,002,428) and in further view of Shinjo et al. (US Patent # 5,644,372).

[Claim 3/1 and 3/2]

Ogata in view of Suzuki teaches the following limitations.

The camera signal processor (figure 1: 25) according to either one of claims 3/1 and 3/2, characterized in that the image enlarging means comprises group forming means for grouping (figure 1: 25), out of the motion detection areas (figures 6E-6G) where an object making abnormal motion exists which have been extracted by the extracting means, the areas where an object making abnormal motion exists such that the areas connected to each other form one group (Ogata, col. 7 lines 56-62, figure 9). Ogata in view

of Suzuki fails to teach center-of-gravity detecting means for extracting, out of groups formed by the group forming means, the group having the largest area, and finding the center of gravity of the extracted group. However Matsumura teaches that it is well known and used in the art to have a center-of-gravity detecting means (figure 10: 136) for extracting, out of groups formed by the group forming means (figure 10:136), the group having the largest area, and finding the center of gravity of the extracted group (col. 18 lines 36-45, figure 16)[CPU 136 is used as a center-of-gravity and group detecting means].

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ogata in view of Suzuki and Matsumura it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a center-of-gravity detecting means for extracting, out of groups formed by the group forming means, the group having the largest area, and finding the center of gravity of the extracted group. Doing so would allow calculating a position data of the center of gravity of the largest block having the largest area as taught in Matsumura (col. 18 lines 46-48).

Ogata in view of Suzuki in further view of Matsumura fails to teach a scaling-up means for scaling up the image picked up by the imaging means, centered on the center of gravity found by the center-of-gravity detecting means, and displaying the scaled-up image on a display device. However Shinjo teaches that it is well known and used in the art to have a scaling up the image picked up by the imaging means, centered on the center of gravity found by the center-of-gravity detecting means, and displaying the scaled-up image on a display device (col. 20 lines 47-51).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Ogata, Suzuki, Matsumura and Shinjo it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have scaling-up means for scaling up the image picked up by the imaging means,

centered on the center of gravity found by the center-of-gravity detecting means, and displaying the scaled-up image on a display device. Doing so would allow performing a good display on the entire display device as taught in Shinjo (col. 20 lines 50-51).

[Claims 6/4 and 6/5]

This is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 3/1 and 3/2. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon the apparatus claim 3/1 and 3/2.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh K Aggarwal whose telephone number is (703) 305-0346. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5: 30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's primary examiner, Vu Le can be reached (703) 308-6613. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

YKA  
April 7, 2004

  
VU LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER